

## Smooth Hammerhead Shark Status Review Report: ID331

### Peer Review Comments

We solicited review of the Draft Smooth Hammerhead Shark Status Review Report from five potential reviewers. Three people agreed to be reviewers and provided reviews. Reviewer comments are compiled below from comments on drafts of the manuscript and are not in the order of the reviewer identification list below.

Reviewers (listed alphabetically):

Dr. Alberto Ferreira de Amorim  
Professor/ Fishery Biologist  
Instituto de Pesca  
Sao Paulo State Government  
Santos, SP, Brazil

Dr. Juan Carlos Pérez Jiménez  
Research Associate  
Department of Sustainability Science  
El Colegio de la Frontera Sur (ECOSUR)  
Campeche, Mexico

Dr. Emilio Sperone  
Researcher  
Department of Biology, Ecology, and Earth Science  
University of Calabria  
Rende CS, Italy

### **Responses to Terms of Reference Questions**

Reviewer #1:

*Draft Status Review of the Smooth Hammerhead Shark*

*Evaluate the adequacy, appropriateness and application of data used in the Status Review document.*

1. *In general, does the Status Review include and cite the best scientific and commercial information available on the species, its biology, stock structure, habitats, threats, and risks of extinction?*

**Yes, the Status Review includes and cites the best scientific production on the biology, ecology and conservation of the Smooth Hammerhead Shark.**

2. *Are the scientific conclusions factually supported, sound, and logical?*

**Yes, they are!**

3. *Where available, are opposing scientific studies or theories acknowledged and discussed?*

**Yes!**

4. *Are the results and conclusions of the Extinction Risk Analysis supported by the information presented?*

**Results and conclusions of the Extinction Risk Analysis are well supported by all the information presented. I appreciated the report, because it is very well written and it describes perfectly the actual knowledge about the Smooth Hammerhead Shark.**

5. *Are uncertainties assessed and clearly stated?*

**Yes, they are!**

Reviewer #2:

*Draft Status Review of the Smooth Hammerhead Shark*

*Evaluate the adequacy, appropriateness and application of data used in the Status Review document.*

1. *In general, does the Status Review include and cite the best scientific and commercial information available on the species, its biology, stock structure, habitats, threats, and risks of extinction?*

**The literature review of the manuscript is very complete. The issues are well placed.**

2. *Are the scientific conclusions factually supported, sound, and logical?*

**I believe so. There is very complete evidence that gives that impression.**

3. *Where available, are opposing scientific studies or theories acknowledged and discussed?*

**I believe so, it is well discussed.**

4. *Are the results and conclusions of the Extinction Risk Analysis supported by the information presented?*

**I believe so, the raised facts and analysis leads to a clear risk of extinction, demanding better monitoring.**

5. *Are uncertainties assessed and clearly stated?*

**Yes, uncertainties are also discussed, but studies lead to the sharp decline of the populations, based on all kinds of fisheries in the three oceans.**

Reviewer #3:

*Draft Status Review of the Smooth Hammerhead Shark*

*Evaluate the adequacy, appropriateness and application of data used in the Status Review document.*

- 1. In general, does the Status Review include and cite the best scientific and commercial information available on the species, its biology, stock structure, habitats, threats, and risks of extinction?*

**Yes, the author includes and cites the best scientific and commercial information available for the Smooth Hammerhead Shark.**

- 2. Are the scientific conclusions factually supported, sound, and logical?*

**Yes, the author provides a comprehensive literature review that supports his conclusions on the status of the Smooth Hammerhead Shark. Results are similar between regions, and conclusions are logical.**

**However, due to the lack of information, the confidence rating for the demographic factors estimated (abundance, productivity, spatial structure and diversity) is low or very low. It is recommended that the author indicates in the executive summary that there is uncertainty in his main conclusions.**

- 3. Where available, are opposing scientific studies or theories acknowledged and discussed?*

**Yes, for example, the author cites opposing studies concluding on the decline of the populations of the Smooth Hammerhead Shark, and discusses with detail in order to make his conclusions.**

- 4. Are the results and conclusions of the Extinction Risk Analysis supported by the information presented?*

**Yes, the analysis is supported with the best scientific information available.**

- 5. Are uncertainties assessed and clearly stated?*

**Yes, uncertainties are considered and clearly stated (however, it is not mentioned in the executive summary). The degree of uncertainty is only qualitatively assessed due to the lack of information.**